



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,131	06/08/2006	Mustapha Abarghaz		1676

26345 7590 10/19/2007
GIBBONS P.C.
ONE GATEWAY CENTER
NEWARK, NJ 07102

EXAMINER

KIFLE, BRUCK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1624

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

10/19/2007

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

thibbits@gibbonslaw.com
abriggs@gibbonslaw.com
IPDocket@gibbonslaw.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/582,131

Applicant(s)

ABARGHAZ ET AL.

Examiner

Bruck Kifle, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 30-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 30-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/08/06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 30-45 and 49-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- i) In claim 30, the term “general” implies more than what is positively recited in the claim. Deletion is suggested as the structural formula and definitions of the variables fully defines the compounds claimed.
- ii) The term “heteroaryl” is indefinite because it is not known how many atoms are present, how many and what kind of heteroatoms are involved, what size ring is intended and how many rings are present.
- iii) In the definition of R₇ and R₁₀ the substituents are listed as preferred. This is improper because it is unclear what else is intended. See MPEP § 2173.05(d). See also claims 31 and 37-44.
- iv) In the definition of R₇ and R_Y it is unclear which acyls are intended. Are only carboxylic acid acyls (alkanoyls) intended or are acyls from other acids also intended (such as, sulfonic, phosphonic, arsenic)?
- v) In the definition of R₈, the term “heterocyclic” is indefinite because it is not known how many atoms make up the ring and what kind of a ring (monocyclic, bicyclic, spiro, fused, bridged, saturated, etc.) is intended.

Regarding claims 46-48, there are more than a reasonable number of compounds present in these independent claims. There are 11 pages of compounds. This number of compounds cannot be considered a reasonable number according to rule 1.140(a).

Art Unit: 1624

See MPEP rule 1.141(a) reproduced below.

1.141 Different inventions in one national application.

(a) Two or more independent and distinct inventions may not be claimed in one national application, except that more than one species of an invention, not to exceed a reasonable number, may be specifically claimed in different claims in one national application, provided the application also includes an allowable claim generic to all the claimed species and all the claims to species in excess of one are written in dependent form (1.75) or otherwise include all the limitations of the generic claim.

Claims 50-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The how to use portion of the statute has not been addressed. This means that Applicants must teach the skilled practitioner, in this case a physician, how to treat a given subject. The physician clearly must know what disease and what symptoms are to be treated. In this case, Applicants have not provided what is being treated by claims 50, 51 and 53-55, who the subject is, how one can identify said subject (i.e. how one can identify a subject in need), given no specific dose, given no specific dosing regimen, given no specific route of administration, and do not specify what diseases or symptom they intend to treat.

Patent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable. Tossing out the mere germ of an idea does not constitute enabling disclosure. *Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk* 42 USPQ2d 1001.

As the Supreme Court said in *Brenner v. Manson*, 148 USPQ at 696: “a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion.” As U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals stated *In re Diedrich* 138 USPQ at 130, quoting with approval from the decision of the board: “We do not believe that it was the intention of the statutes to require the Patent Office, the courts, or the public to play the sort of guessing game that might be involved if an applicant could satisfy the requirements of the statutes by indicating the usefulness of a claimed compound in terms of possible use so general as to be meaningless and then, after his research or that of his competitors has definitely ascertained an actual use for the compound, adducing evidence intended to show that a particular specific use would have been obvious to men skilled in the particular art to which this use relates.”

The origin and the nature of many central nervous system disorders such as Depression, Meningitis (viral, bacteria, or fungi infection), Encephalitis (viral infection), Rett syndrome, Tinnitus, Narcolepsy, Shy-Drager syndrome, Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease, Tarsal tunnel syndrome, Psychosis, Memory loss, Mental retardation, Autism, Migraine, Tension headache, Multiple sclerosis, etc are different one from the other. The symptoms and nature of these diseases are also different one from the other. Some CNS disorders are hereditary (Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease). Many CNS disorders vary in how they affect the body and its functions. Diseases such as Cerebral palsy, and Parkinson's disease affect the movement of the patient. Diseases such as Alzheimer's disease affect the memory of the patient. Since the origin and nature of CNS disorders vary extremely one from the other, it is impossible to treat central nervous system disorders in general.

It has been recited in claim 57, a method of treating neurodegenerative disorders. There is no such an agent, which can treat neurodegenerative disorders generally. That is because neurodegenerative disorders are extremely varied in origin and nature of effect. The origin and the nature of many neurodegenerative disorders such as Huntington's disease, Pick's disease, Frontotemporal dementia, Cerebro-Oculo-Facio-Skeletal (COFS) syndrome (cranofacial and skeletal abnormalities), Motor neuron disease (muscle weakness), Corticobasal ganglionic degeneration, Creutzfeldt-Jacob disease (fatal disease), Dementia with Lewy bodies, and Progressive supranuclear palsy Dementia are different one from the other. Many neurodegenerative disorders are untreatable to this day.

The symptoms and nature of these diseases are also different one from the other. It can be shown that many of these neurodegenerative disorders have different origin and nature of effect. Some neurodegenerative disorders are hereditary (Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease). Many neurodegenerative disorders vary in how they affect the body and its functions. Diseases such as Cerebral palsy, and Parkinson's disease affect the movement of the patient. Diseases such as Alzheimer's disease affect the memory of the patient.

Applicants have not demonstrated nor have they alleged there is any correlation between the *in vitro* assays they disclose in pages 83-93 and clinical efficacy against any disease. Case law is clear on this point. In an unpredictable art, such as CNS disease therapy, *in vitro* assays may be used for enablement only if there is a well-established correlation between the assay and clinical efficacy.

The how to use requirement of the enablement statute, when applied to method claim, refers to operability and how to make the claimed method work “The factors to be considered (in making an enablement rejection) have been summarized as the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art and the breadth of the claims”, In re Rainer 146 USPQ 218 (1965); In re Colianni, 195 USPQ 150, Ex parte Formal, 230 USPQ 546. The issue is the correlation between clinical efficacy for the diseases embraced by the claims and Applicants' in vitro assays.

a) Determining if any particular claimed compound would treat any and all of the diseases embraced would require synthesis of the compound, formulation into a suitable dosage form, and subjecting it to clinical trials with a number of fundamentally different diseases claimed, or to testing them in an assay known to be correlated to clinical efficacy of such treatment. This is a large degree of experimentation.

b) The direction concerning treating these diseases found in the specification merely states Applicants' intention to do so. Since no PDE2 inhibitor has ever been used to treat the diseases in the claims how is the skilled physician to know what dose to use for each of these different diseases?

c) There is no working example of treatment of any rejected disease in man or animals.

d) The nature of the invention is clinical treatment of disease with inhibitors of PDE2, which involves physiological activity. For example, the notion that a compound could be effective against drug addiction in general is absolutely contrary to our current understanding of

Art Unit: 1624

how chemical dependencies operate. There is not, and probably never will be, a pharmacological treatment for “drug addiction” generally. That is because “drug addiction” is not a single disease or cluster of related disorders, but in fact, a collection with relatively little in common. Addiction to barbiturates, alcohol, cocaine, opiates, amphetamines, benzodiazepines, nicotine, etc. all involve different parts of the CNS system; different receptors in the body. For example, cocaine binds at the dopamine reuptake transmitter. Heroin addiction, for example, arises from binding at the opiate receptors, cigarette addiction from some interaction at the nicotinic acid receptors, many tranquilizers involve the benzodiazepine receptor, alcohol involves yet another system, etc. All attempts to find an pharmaceutical to treat chemical addictions generally have thus failed.

Sleep disorders embrace “opposites” (narcolepsy and sleeplessness).

e) The state of the clinical arts in the PDE 2 inhibitor related diseases reports no success in treating the diseases recited.

f) The artisan using Applicants invention would be a physician with a MD degree and several years of experience.

g) It is well established that “the scope of enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved”, and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

h) The scope of the claims involves all of the thousands of compounds as well as the hundreds of diseases embraced by the claims. Thus, the scope of the claim is very broad. The scope of uses embraced by these claims is not remotely enabled based solely on instant compounds ability to inhibit PDE2.


Art Unit: 1624

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruck Kifle, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0668. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 8:30 AM -6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Bruck Kifle, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1624

BK
October 14, 2007